<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 46 through 61 are pending, with Claims 46 and 51 being independent.

Claims 46 through 61 yet again were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2003/0164976 A1 (<u>Ihara, et al.</u>) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,778 B1 (<u>Valdez, Jr.</u>) and Applicants' own specification. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 46 and 51 recite, *inter alia*, that contents data is sent in broadcast, from which document data is extracted, the document data including <u>both</u> (a) the script and (b) a plurality of status display information, wherein, in accordance with the acquired status information, there is identifying of status display information indicating a status of the printer from the plurality of status display information.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of <u>Ihara, et al.</u>, <u>Valdez, Jr.</u>, and the relied-upon portions of Applicants' own specification, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 46 and 51.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that even if <u>Valdez, et al.</u> teaches receiving markup language, there is *absolutely no suggestion* in <u>Valdez, et al.</u> that such markup language includes <u>both the claimed script and the claimed plurality of status display information</u>.

The Official Action states that <u>Ihara, et al.</u> discloses the use of a IEEE-1394 printer and says that "thus the combination of Ihara and Valdez provides a TV system the ability to receive markup language data in addition to broadcast programs and carry out the instructions/script data received by using the 1394 interface in order to ensure the printer is capable of executing/carry

2

out requested operations". Applicants respectfully traverse this statement. Applicants respectfully submit that Ihara, et al.'s use of IEEE-1394 simply does not imply at all that a script (using markup language) is executed to acquire a printer status in the manner claimed, and Valdez, et al. does not remedy this deficiency.

The Official Action states that Applicants' own specification admits that the script and plurality of status display information is received via a broadcast. In particular, the Official Action states, *inter alia*: (a) "Initially, it is noted that the applicant's disclosure state that the script and plurality of status display information is received via a broadcast, thus the information is included the received signal", and (b) "It is noted that applicant's own specification discloses that by incorporating a browser into a television a user may receive broadcasts/markup language data and perform the operations as claimed (see para, 04, 05, 09, 57, 59, 68 and 80 specifically)". All such statements are respectfully traversed.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that several of the relied-upon portions of Applicants' own specification (e.g., [0057], [0059], [0068], and [0080]) are descriptions of Applicants' own embodiments and *cannot* be relied upon by the Official Action as admissions of prior art vis-a-vis the claimed features. (Applicants respectfully note that paragraph [0057] does indeed refer to the ISO standard, but Applicants submit that said paragraph contains *no admission* that the specific *claimed* content of the broadcast data used by Applicants is prior art.)

Second, the remaining relied-upon portions of Applicants' own specification (e.g., [0004], [0005], [0009], etc.) are *completely silent* as regards the above-discussed claimed features — in point of fact, there is no disclosure suggesting a sequence of features and processes as claimed in the subject application. Those portions of the specification merely state, *inter alia*:

3

Digital data is commonly broadcast using the DSM-CC

data carousel defined in the ISO/IEC Standard 13818-6.

The broadcast data, filtered through the transport

decoder 253, includes text information, script

information, picture information, and video and audio

data, and the text information is described in the XML

(extensible Markup Language) defined in the World

Wide Web Consortium (W3C).

While "text information" is mentioned, Applicants respectfully submit there is *no suggestion*

whatsoever that the text information includes a plurality of status display information (from

which is identified display information indicating a status of the printer) as claimed. And while

"script information" is mentioned, Applicants respectfully submit that there is *no suggestion*

whatsoever that the script information includes a script for acquiring status information of the

printer as claimed. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully traverse the Official

Action's reliance upon Applicants' own specification.

Accordingly, even if the documents could be combined as proposed, Applicants

respectfully submit the combination would be altogether devoid of any mention of at least the

above-discussed claimed features including the claimed script and plurality of status display

information (both having been received via broadcast as claimed).

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 46 and 51.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. For example, Claims 48 and 53 recite, *inter alia*, executing the script at a predetermined period; Claims 49 and 54 recite, *inter alia*, starting an operation of the timer after the content data for printing is sent to the printer; Claims 50 and 55 recites, *inter alia*, switching the power of the printer on after the status information is acquired; Claim 57 recites, *inter alia*, that the document data comprises print button text; and Claims 58 through 61 variously recite, *inter alia*, that the plurality of status display information *included in the document data* comprises (a) text informing a user that the printer is ready to print (Claim 58), (b) text informing a user that the printer has completed printing (Claim 59); (c) text informing a user that the printer is not compatible with a requested paper size (Claim 60); and (d) text informing a user that the printer has stopped printing (Claim 61).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied documents, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that they could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61. With respect to Claims 57 through 61, Applicants wish to emphasize that the status display information in question is *included in the document data*.

With further reference to the dependent claims, the Official Action makes reference to "IEEE1394" and states that, as a result, the features of the dependent claims are known and that

5

Applicants should identify the disclosure in the application. First, the reliance upon IEEE1394 is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that even if IEEE1394 could be combined with the above-discussed combination of documents, the resulting combination would still fail to disclose or suggest the features of the dependent claims as recited in combination. Second, support for the dependent claims may be found, e.g., as follows: (a) Claims 47 and 52, e.g., Fig. 11; (b) Claims 48, 49, 53, and 54, e.g., [0089], (c) Claim 50, 55, e.g., [0080], (d) Claim 56, e.g., Fig. 14, (e) Claim 57, e.g., [0076], (f) Claim 58, e.g., Fig. 14, item c, (g) Claim 59, e.g., Fig. 22, (h) Claim 60, e.g., [0085], and (i) Claim 61, e.g., Fig. 18, among other places. Of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments. Third, Applicants respectfully believe that the burden remains upon the Office — *not Applicants* — to establish where the specific terms of the dependent claims are to be found in the prior art, and absent such a showing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims should be allowed. MPEP 2144.03. Favorable consideration is this regard is earnestly solicited.

In view of the foregoing, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/mcm

FCHS_WS 1813890v1